



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,029	03/13/2000	Cynthia S. Bell	INTL-0333-US	6169

7590 12/22/2004

Timothy N Trop
TROP PRUNER & HU P C
8554 Katy Freeway Ste 100
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

CHOW, DOON Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2675	15

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/524,029	BELL, CYNTHIA S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Moyer	2675	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Appeal

(1) Michael J. Moyer.

(3) _____

(2) Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 August 2003

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
N/A

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

encl. - PTO-1449


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Board of Appeals wanted to know if the IDS, paper no. 2, was ever considered by the examiner, Michael J. Moyer. The examiner searched through the case but could not find the signed copy of the IDS statement. Therefore I called the attorney and asked for him to fax me a copy of the signed IDS statement, which I received on 22 August 2003. Upon further review of the signed copy of the IDS, the examiner noticed that the cited documents were inadvertently crossed out. The examiner has read and considered the cited documents and the patented reference of the IDS.